REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-20, 28, and 29 are pending. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-20, and 28-31 will be pending, claims 1, 9, 28, and 29 having been amended and claims 30 and 31 added. The amendments to claims 1 and 9 find support in the specification, page 8, lines 6-8, 18-19, for example. Support for the amendments to claims 28 and 29 can be found in the specification, page 8, lines 10-14, and FIG. 5 (broken lines 16, 17), for example. The new claims find support in the specification, page 9, line 23, through page 10, line 17, and FIG. 9, for example. There are no issues of new matter.

Claim 16 stands objected to for the phrase "computer readable medium" not being explicitly mentioned in the specification.

The specification has been amended to explicitly mention the phrase "computer readable medium." There are no issues of new matter. By definition, the machine memory described in the specification, page 8, lines 18-23, is a computer readable medium which stores application data, such as computer programs. Original claim 16 recites that a computer program controls the machine according to the method claims. This means that the computer program includes the modeling software and executes the method steps on various machine components, as described in the specification, page 6, lines 10-23, and page 7, line 23, through page 8, line 16. This also means that the computer program is resident in the machine's memory (or computer readable medium), as recited in the present claim 16. The objection should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that the Action does not articulate the basis for the objection or the reason that Applicants' previous response of July 8, 2008 was insufficient to overcome the objection. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner do so, including identifying the requisite patent statute or rule with which the objected-to claim fails to comply, such that Applicants can provide a more complete response should it be necessary.

Claims 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, and 18 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Applicants traverse the objection.

A multiple dependent claim is in proper form if it refers back in the alternative to more than one preceding claim that is not itself in multiple dependent form. See, e.g., 37 CFR 1.75(c) and MPEP 608.01(n). The objected-to claims are properly in the alternative. The objected-to claims also properly do not refer back to other multiple dependent claims. Therefore, the objected-to claims satisfy the requirements under 37 CFR 1.75(c). A comparable example is "Claim 4" in the "Acceptable Multiple Dependent Claim Wording" section of MPEP 608.01(n). The objection should be withdrawn. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants request that the Examiner point to the specific language in the objected-to claims that does not satisfy the requirements under 37 CFR 1.75 and explain why not.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-12, 14-16, 18, 19, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaplan (US 6,819,008). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites a control map comprising, *inter alia*, a predetermined angle correction factor to be applied to a predetermined portion of an advance angle profile, where the angle correction factor depends on a difference between a measured input power to an electrical machine and a predetermined input power at a predetermined rotor speed of the machine.

Applicants have discovered that, by predetermining the angle correction factor, memory can be more efficiently and effectively used when operating the machine. See, e.g., specification, page 2, lines 3-4, 14-16.

In contrast, Kaplan neither discloses nor suggests Applicants' claimed control map, in particular the predetermined angle correction factor. First, Kaplan does not disclose or suggest that its control map includes its conduction angle adjustment (which the Action equates with Applicants' angle correction factor), unlike Applicants' control map which does include its angle correction factor. See Kaplan, 7:6-26. Second, even if Kaplan's control map did include its conduction angle adjustment, Kaplan's control map would still not be the control map that Applicants claim because Kaplan's conduction angle adjustment is not predetermined, like Applicants' angle correction factor. Rather, Kaplan discloses that its conduction angle

adjustment is determined real-time via a feedback loop during operation of an electrical generator. See Kaplan, 8:31-36.

There would have been no reason to modify Kaplan's control map to include conduction angle adjustments since the control map and the conduction angle adjustments serve different temporal purposes. While the control map is constructed for repeated use, the conduction angle adjustment is calculated for one-time use with current generator conditions. Therefore, to include the conduction angle adjustments as part of the control map would be a waste of memory. Neither would there have been any reason to modify Kaplan's conduction angle adjustments to go from real-time determination, considered by Kaplan to provide high efficiency, to predetermination.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Kaplan. The same logic applies to claim 9 and its dependent claims. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 28, which depends from claim 1, has been amended to recite that the angle correction factor is applied to the on-advance angle and the off-advance angle of the rotor such that a rotation angle between the on-advance and off-advance angles is substantially unchanged.

In contrast, Kaplan discloses that its conduction angle, i.e., the rotation angle between its turn-on (on-advance) angle and turn-off (off-advance) angle, is changed. See Kaplan, 8:63-9:20. There would have been no reason to modify Kaplan to keep its conduction angle substantially unchanged since Kaplan's objective is to do the opposite.

Claim 28 is not anticipated by Kaplan. The same logic applies to claim 29, which depends from claim 9.

Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-20, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ookawa (US 5,796,226) in view of Kaplan. Applicants traverse the rejection.

The Action, page 7, item 6, concedes that Ookawa neither discloses nor suggests Applicants' claimed angle correction factor. Ookawa's deficiencies are not overcome by Kaplan. As discussed above, Kaplan fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed angle

correction factor. Therefore, the combination of Ookawa and Kaplan does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed angle correction factor.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Ookawa in view of Kaplan. The same logic applies to claim 9 and its dependent claims. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 stands rejected to under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ookawa in view of Elliott (US 6,313,597). Applicants traverse the rejection.

As discussed previously, Ookawa does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed angle correction factor. Ookawa's deficiencies are not overcome by Elliott because Elliott also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed angle correction factor. Rather, Elliott discloses a look-up table that provides energization information as a function of rotor speed for a cleaning apparatus. See Elliott, 3:29-36. Elliott neither discloses nor suggests that its look-up table includes any type of predetermined correction factors. Therefore, the combination of Ookawa and Kaplan does not disclose or suggests Applicants' claimed angle correction factor. Claim 20 is patentable over Ookawa in view of Elliott. The rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 13, and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Kaplan. Applicants traverse the rejection.

As discussed previously, Kaplan does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed angle correction factor. Neither would there have been any reason to modify Kaplan to do so. Claims 8, 13, and 20, which depend from either claim 1 or claim 9, are patentable over Kaplan. The rejection should be withdrawn.

New claims 30 and 31 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 9, respectively. Moreover, none of the cited references, in particular Kaplan, discloses or suggests an angle correction factor that further depends on an input voltage, as in claims 30 and 31.

Each of the pending claims in this application is in condition for immediate allowance. A Notice of Allowance is requested.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 424662013300.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 23, 2008

By: Cassandra T. Swain

Cassandra T. Swain, Ph.D.
Registration No. 48,361

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 400
Mclean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 760-7706
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777